



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/754,390	01/09/2004	Abaneshwar Prasad	100196	7753
29050 7590 03/31/2011 STEVEN WESEMAN ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, I.P. CABOT MICROELECTRONICS CORPORATION 870 NORTH COMMONS DRIVE AURORA, IL 60504				
EXAMINER				
MULLER, BRYAN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3727				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/754,390

Applicant(s)

PRASAD ET AL.

Examiner

BRYAN R. MULLER

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/23/2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reinhardt ('902) in view of Lakes (4,668,557) and Furukawa et al. (WO03/058698A1; US publication 2005/0107007 referenced as English translation).
3. In reference to claim 1, Reinhardt discloses a polishing pad made of polyester and polyether polyurethanes and further discloses that the pads may be formed by foaming (col. 2, lines 43-48), thus forming the polishing pad out of a polyester and polyether polyurethane foam that is inherently porous (based on the definition of foam of "Any of various light, **porous**, semirigid or spongy materials¹"). However, Reinhardt fails to disclose that the porous polymeric material has a Poisson's ratio less than zero. Lakes discloses a method of making polymeric foams that have negative Poisson's ratios and teaches that the negative Poisson's ratio polymeric foams can replace polymeric foams having positive Poisson's ratios in many applications to provide improved properties. Lakes further disclose that polymeric foams having negative Poisson's ratios are more advantageous than conventional foam materials in

¹ The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition
Copyright © 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company.
Published by Houghton Mifflin Company. All rights reserved.

applications where superior strength and abrasion resistance are desired along with a compliant foam (col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 3). It is well known in the art that superior strength and abrasion resistance are desired properties for polishing pads and Furukawa specifically discloses that high abrasion resistance is a requirement for long life of polishing pads (paragraph 8) and further teaches that polishing pads made of foamed polyurethane (such as the pads disclosed by Reinhardt) generally fail to have the desired abrasion resistance to provide long life of the polishing pad. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the conventional polyurethane foam of the Reinhardt polishing pad with polyurethane foam having a Poisson's ration below zero, to improve strength and abrasion resistance, which are well known in the art as desired properties of polishing pads and will increase the life of the polishing pad, as taught by Furukawa.

4. In reference to claims 2 and 3, it further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to produce the polyether polyurethane foam having a negative Poisson's ratio using the method disclosed by Lakes and Lakes further provides a specific example of a polyester foam that was produced using the disclosed method that has a Poisson's ration of -0.7 (col. 3, lines 38-62). Although Lakes does not disclose a specific example of a polyether polyurethane foam, it would be obvious that the polyether polyurethane foam of Reinhardt will have very similar properties to a polyester foam and once treated using the method of Lakes would have a Poisson's ratio similar to that of the treated polyester foam example of Lakes. Thus, it would have been obvious that the polyether polyurethane foam, having a Poisson's ratio of less than

zero, would have a Poisson's ratio of about -0.7, which falls within the claimed range of about -0.8 to about -0.2.

5. In reference to claim 4, polyester, polyether and polyurethane are all materials that are well known as thermoplastic and/or thermoset polymers.

6. In reference to claims 5 and 6, Reinhardt discloses that the polishing pad is made of polyester and polyether polyurethanes, as discussed supra.

7. In reference to claim 7, Reinhardt discloses that the polymeric product will preferably have a density of greater than 0.5 g/cm^3 (col. 2, lines 60-64), which provides a range that overlaps the claimed range of 1 g/cm^3 or less, and thus provides a proper rejection of the claimed range (See MPEP §2131.03).

8. In reference to claims 16 and 17, Reinhardt further discloses that the polishing pad may comprise abrasive particles of alumina, silica, titania or ceria (col. 2, lines 49-59).

9. In reference to claims 18-20, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to polish a work piece through the method of: providing a work piece to be polished, contacting the work piece with a chemical-mechanical polishing system comprising the polishing pad discussed supra and abrading at least a portion of the surface of the work piece with the polishing system to polish the work piece.

10. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reinhardt ('902) in view of Lakes (4,668,557) and Furukawa et al. (WO03/058698A1;

US publication 2005/0107007 referenced as English translation) and further in view of Sevilla et al ('532).

11. Reinhardt in view of Lakes and Furukawa provides a polishing pad as discussed supra but fails to disclose that the pad has a void volume of about 75% or less or that the average pore diameter in the pad is between 0.1 and 2500 μm . Sevilla discloses a polishing pad made of a porous substrate and teaches that an average pore diameter from about 5 to 100 μm (microns) will enhance pad polishing performance (abstract, lines 5-7) and that a porosity or pore volume (void volume) between about 15% and 70%, preferably between 25% and 50%, has been found to yield acceptable polishing pads possessing the necessary flexibility and durability in use (col. 5, lines 28-34). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the pad of Reinhardt, made of polyester and polyether polyurethane foam should possess pores with an average diameter between 5 and 100 μm to enhance pad polishing performance and a porosity between 15% and 70% to provide the polishing pad with the necessary flexibility and durability for use.

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reinhardt ('902) in view of Lakes (4,668,557) and Furukawa et al. (WO03/058698A1; US publication 2005/0107007 referenced as English translation) and further in view of Suzuki et al ('353).

13. Reinhardt in view of Lakes and Furukawa provides a polishing pad as discussed supra but fails to disclose that the pores in the pad should have a pore density greater than about 10 pores/cm. Suzuki discloses a polishing method including a polishing pad

and teaches that the surface roughness of the work piece is dramatically improved when finish polishing is conducted using a finish polishing pad with a pore density equal to or higher than a value (col. 3, 8-11) and further discloses a polishing pad with a pore density equal to or higher than 150 pores/cm² (approximately 12.2 pores/cm).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the pad of Reinhardt, made of polyester and polyether polyurethane foam, should have a pore density greater than or equal to 150 pores/cm² in order to dramatically improve the finish of a work piece through polishing.

14. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reinhardt ('902) in view of Lakes (4,668,557) and Furukawa et al. (WO03/058698A1; US publication 2005/0107007 referenced as English translation) and further in view of Osterheld et al ('596).

15. Reinhardt in view of Lakes and Furukawa provides a polishing pad as discussed supra but fails to disclose that the surface of the polishing pad should comprise of linear grooves in the form of an XY crosshatch. Osterheld discloses a method and apparatus for chemical mechanical polishing using a patterned pad and teaches that a plurality of slurry distribution/retaining grooves are distributed with a first portion extending linearly over the surface of the pad along the x-axis and a second portion extends linearly over the surface of the pad along the y-axis defining an X-Y grid pattern (col. 5, lines 7-14) and that the grooves are adapted to inhibit slurry or other fluids from flowing off the pad during operation. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the pad of Reinhardt, made of polyester and polyether

polyurethane foam should have linear grooves in the form of an XY crosshatch in order to distribute a slurry while preventing the slurry from flowing off the pad during operation.

16. Claims 14, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reinhardt ('902) in view of Lakes (4,668,557) and Furukawa et al. (WO03/058698A1; US publication 2005/0107007 referenced as English translation) and further in view of Tang ('927).

17. Reinhardt in view of Lakes and Furukawa provides a polishing pad as discussed supra but fails to disclose an optically transmissive region that has a light transmission of at least 10% at one or more wavelengths between 190nm and 3500nm. Tang discloses an *in-situ* monitoring technique for end point detection during chemical mechanical polishing planarization including a polishing pad with an optically transmissive region. Tang teaches that the light source is capable of illuminating in the range of about 200 to 11,000 nm in wavelength and that when the wavelength is measured from the back side of the substrate (opposite light source) the wavelength is preferred to be 1,300 nm (col. 5, lines 6-12) which would be at least 11.8% of the light source being transmitted through the substrate. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the pad of Reinhardt, made of polyester and polyether polyurethane foam, with an optically transmissive region that has a light transmission of at least 11.8% at one or more wavelengths between 200nm and 11,000nm to monitor the end point during chemical mechanical polishing. It would also be obvious to polish a work piece by provide a work

piece to be polished, contacting the work piece with a chemical mechanical polishing system comprising the pad of Reinhardt, made of polyester and polyether polyurethane foam with an optically transmissive region and abrading at least a portion of the surface of the work piece with this polishing system.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed 3/23/2011, in response to the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the combination of the Reinhardt, Lakes and Furukawa references (as well as the additional references applied to the rejections above) fail to make obvious the applicant's claimed invention. However, as discussed in the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, mailed on 1/26/2011, the disclosure of Reinhardt in view of the teachings of Lakes and Furukawa *do* make obvious the polishing pad having a negative Poisson's ratio as claimed.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Srinharan et al (6,743,388) and Alderson et al (6,878,320) both disclose additional advantages that are provided to polymer materials when they are treated to have negative Poisson's ratios.

20. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRYAN R. MULLER whose telephone number is (571)272-4489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica S. Carter can be reached on (571) 272-4475. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3727

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bryan R Muller/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3727
3/28/2011